

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8, 11-19, 22, 34, 36-46, 48-57, 70, 72-81, 106, 107, 109-113, 115-117, and 124-135 are pending in the present application. Claims 34, 36, 48, 46, 70, and 72 are amended and Claims 35, 47, 71, and 82-93 are canceled without prejudice by the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 82-93 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Takeda (U.S. Patent No. 5,937,750) in view of Takahashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,117,257, herein "Takahashi"); Claims 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Takeda in view of Takahashi and Kanno (U.S. Patent No. 6,718,872); Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Takeda in view of Takahashi, Kanno and Tomono et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,400,065, herein "Tomono"); Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Takeda, Takahashi, and Ozaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,207,157, herein "Ozaki"); Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Takeda in view of Takahashi, and Tanaka (Japanese Patent No. JP 2001-239733); Claims 12-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Asai et al. (Japanese Patent No. JP 2002-172839, herein "Asai") in view of Takeda and Takahashi; Claims 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Asai in view of Takeda, Takahashi, and Kanno; Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Asai in view of Takeda, Takahashi, Kanno, and Tomono; Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Asai in view of Takeda, Takahashi and Ozaki; Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Asai in view of Takeda, Takahashi, Ozaki, and Tanaka; Claims 34, 38, 70, and 74 were rejected

under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Takeda in view of Hiroshi; Claims 39, 40, 75, and 76 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Takeda in view of Hiroshi and Kanno; Claim 41 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Takeda in view of Hiroshi, Kanno, and Tomono; Claims 43 and 79 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Takeda, Hiroshi, and Ito; Claims 42 and 78 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Takeda, Hiroshi, and Ozaki; Claims 45 and 81 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Takeda in view of Hiroshi, and Tanaka; Claims 46 and 82 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Asai in view of Hiroshi; Claims 50, 55, 86, and 91 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Asai in view of Hiroshi and Takeda; Claims 51, 52, 87, and 88 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Asai in view of Hiroshi, Takeda, and Kanno; Claims 53 and 89 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Asai in view of Hiroshi, Takeda, Ito, Kanno, and Tomono; Claims 54 and 90 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Asai, Hiroshi, Takeda, and Ozaki; Claims 56 and 57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Asai in view of Hiroshi, Takeda, Ito, and Tanaka; Claim 77 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Takeda in view of Hiroshi and Tomono; Claims 92 and 93 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Asai in view of Hiroshi, Takeda, Ito, and Tanaka; Claims 106, 107, and 109 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Takeda in view of Hiroshi et al. (Japanese Patent JP 05-70010, herein "Hiroshi"); Claims 110 and 111 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Takeda in view of Hiroshi and Kanno; Claims 112 and 113 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Asai in view of Hiroshi; Claim 115 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Asai in view of Hiroshi and Takeda; Claims 116 and 117 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Takeda in view of Hiroshi and Kanno; Claims

124-135 were allowed; and Claims 35-37, 44, 47-49, 71-73, and 80 were indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter. In view of this indication, independent Claim 34 has been amended to recite the allowable subject matter of Claim 35, independent Claim 46 has been amended to recite the allowable subject matter of Claim 47, independent Claim 70 has been amended to recite the allowable subject matter of Claim 71, and rejected Claims 82-93 have been canceled without prejudice.

Therefore, it is believed that the outstanding rejection of Claims 82-93 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is overcome and Claims 1-8, 11-19, 22, 34, 36-46, 48-57, 70, 72-81, 106, 107, 109-113, 115-117, and 124-135 are in condition for allowance.

The previously filed amendment amended independent Claim 1 to recite the allowable subject matter of Claim 10, independent Claim 12 to recite the allowable subject matter of Claim 21, independent Claim 106 to recite the allowable subject matter of Claim 108, and independent Claim 112 to recite the allowable subject matter of Claim 114. However, the outstanding Office Action does not address the added features to the independent claims and appears to state in error that Claims 1, 12, 106, and 112 and each of the claims depending therefrom are rejected.

Thus, Applicants discussed with Examiner Ferguson on December 11, 2006, these matters and Examiner Ferguson indicated that she will reconsider in more details all the claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 12, 106, and 112, as amended by the response filed August 4, 2006, be considered on the merits and the outstanding rejections on the merits for these claims be withdrawn.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



---

Gregory J. Maier  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 28,870

Remus F. Fetea, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 59,140

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413-2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)

GJM:RFF\dt  
I:\ATTY\RFF\24S\240831\240831US-AM-12-12-06.DOC